DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 562 TE 500 603

AUTHOR WORTHEN, RICHARD
TITLE THE DEPARTMENT AS CENTER OF INQUIRY.
PUB DATE 28 NOV 69
NOTE 26P.; SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 28, 1969

EDRS PRICE EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.40
DESCRIPTORS ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION, CHANGING ATTITUDES, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, CURRICULUM DESIGN, DEPARTMENTS, *EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION, EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, *ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS, *ENGLISH INSTRUCTION, HUMAN DIGNITY, HUMANISM, *HUMAN RELATIONS, *JUNIOR COLLEGES, LITERATURE, PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT, RESEARCH, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTERS, SELF ESTEEM, STUDENT NEEDS, UNDERGRADUATE STUDY

ABSTRACT

THE COLLEGE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT IS PRAISED FOR ITS GENUINELY HUMAN CONCERNS FOR STUDENT AND FACULTY NEEDS, PARTICIPATORY ADMINISTRATION, AND CURRICULUM PLANNING APPROACHES. CONTRASTED VARIOUSLY WITH THIS MODEL IS THE TRADITIONAL, HIERARCHICAL DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH CRITICIZED FOR ITS UNRELINQUISHED EMPHASIS ON LITERATURE PER SE AND A DEARTH OF FORWARD-LOOKING PEDAGOGICAL THINKING. ALSO CRITICIZED IS THE CALIFORNIA MOVEMENT TOWARD EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES BASED EXCLUSIVELY ON BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES, AS THE PLANNING/PROGRAMMING/BUDGETING SYSTEM (PPBS) LAW WILL REQUIRE IN 1970 ON A STATEWIDE BASIS IN ALL SUBJECT AREAS. EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION OF JUNIOR COLLEGE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT PHILOSOPHIES AND PRACTICES RANGES FROM "COMMUNITY", INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS, SYMBOLIC BEHAVIOR AND SELF-ESTEEM, INTELLECTUAL ENCOUNTERS, LITERATURE, COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS, TEACHER PREPARATION, AND THE TRAINING-EDUCATION DICHOTOMY TO FINANCE, PROGRAM EVALUATION, MODEL PROGRAMS, NEGATIVE NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL PATTERNS, TEACHER AUTONOMY, DIALOGUE, COMMUNICATION, AND RESPONSIBLE MILITANCY. THE AUTHOR OFFERS A SEVEN-POINT PROGRAM TO HELP BUILD A MILIEU OF TEACHING AND LEARNING BASED ON MUTUAL TRUST AND ELEVEN TOPICS FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION BY ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS. (RI)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED036562

THE DEPARTMENT AS CENTER OF INQUIRY

Speech delivered at NCTE Convention, November 28, 1969

by Richard Worthen

TE 500 603

In the latest issue of the magazine Change In Higher Education, Benjamin DeMott wrote:

> While we have an obligation to protect each other's rights, we have a responsibility larger still--that of inventing an academic world consciously and explicitly adjusted to the huge variousness of the means by which men develop intellectucal power and understanding.

We can build such a world only through open and tough minded dialogue directed at problems of pedagogy and practiced at the national, regional and institutional levels, but most importantly at the department level. The major obstacle to meeting such an obvious need is noted in the Duke Alumni Register of June 1967; "Academicians have many beautiful activities, but interpersonal relations is not one of them. Any Ford factory is probably better, and the corner bar is better yet." English teachers as I've observed them are not singularly gifted at conducting dialogues directed at problems of pedagogy. Certainly in their graduate preparation they have experienced a paucity of helpful and exciting models.

Just the same, until we who teach English find some acceptable and responsible means of assessing together the total function of English--one that comes to grips with the needs of all studerts at all levels--we can expect that our case for support in the public mind is likely to grow weaker rather than stronger. I am saying,

of course, that we in English are in trouble, and because I don't want to sound more brash than I am, I want to cite a respected voice which shares my concern. Robert Hogan at the ADE Seminar in Albuquerque this summer said:

> What faces the profession in the immediate and continuing future is the need to make the case for English (which presently accounts for up to one fourth of the school's teaching time) and to make it in several parts. The questions being asked are varied. Does it really deserve that much time? Do the components that make it up, logically belong together any more? Is so much attention going to oonventional content and skills that other content and skills needed for the now and the future are being scanted? (And the worst question) What valuable, observable, measurable difference does the study of English make in the life of the student?

Despite the apparent ascendency of behaviorism -- a subject I will refer to later -- Hogan says:

> English will survive. The question is whether the teachers -- school and college -- who "profess" English want to occupy the central position they now maintain, or whether they will be content to move toward peripheral positions analogous to those occupied by Latin and Greek in the schools, or to the one occupied by Classics in many colleges and universities. It is well and good to argue that central to our responsibility is giving our students, at whatever level, access to the best man has thought and said. A basis question is, "How many are listening to what we have selected as the best that man has thought or said?" The answer to be, "Not very many."

As I seek a perspective from which to view the nature of our trouble and how the profession has responded, two pieced of writing come to mind: Albert Marckwardt's presentation at the MLA convention in 1966, "From the Basic Issues Conference to the Dartmouth Seminar: Perspectives on the Teaching of English" and Michael Shugrue's volume, <u>English in a Decade of Change</u>. I see them as summarizing descriptions of our quest for a viable metaphor through which English can sustain itself today, or of the quest for a discipline to fit the modern

world, and it appears to me that, kicking and screaming, we are being slowly dragged to the forum where we will either communicate with each other or cease to be the largest and potentially most influential segment of the curriculum. I want to suggest that one large source of our trouble is an unwillingness to expose our raison d'etre to the hard dialogue I referred to earlier, or indeed to accept open face to face dialogue on our pedagogical concerns as essential to our well being and existence as the basic discipline of the total curriculum a discipline now in danger to being sub-divided and liquidated. Let me quote from a book which I think offers a conception which could help us survive and live in some harmony with these decade of change, The Curriculum and the Disciplines of Knowledge, by Arthur King and John Brownell. They write:

> From the universality of intellect, the human community becomes possible. Here in the warmth, security, and compassion of other persons, children master the meanings of symbols and model their thoughts and behavior. Without success in symbolic meanings the young person loses the esteem of others and thereby his self-esteem. (page 21)
>
> And
>
> ... By becoming disciplined in symbolic behavior, the young lose dependence on adults; they grow in self-esteem; they move toward freedom. Freedon is the right of choice, and the essence of choice appears to be a symbolic function -- the ability to foresee the several possibilities, to weight them, and to direct behavior. (page 21)
>
> And Finally
>
> Every student, regardless, of race, color, creed, level of ability, age, sex, grade in school, family background, economic condition, level of aspiration, or perceived needs is driven by his very nature to seek intellectual encounter, to exercise the talents for symbolic behavior availbble for all men. Every student is worthy of an encounter with the disciplines of knowledge. (page 34)

Sweeping as these statements may sound to ears accustomed to hearing "English" as a term interchangeable with "literature", I suggest that the symbolic activities described here are essentially those that English must oversee in the total curriculum and that this overseeing function is what makes English qualitatively different from the other disciplines in the curriculum, that our responsibility is and has been to parse out the vagaries of symbolic behavior, and, with our students, bring the resulting understandings to bear upon the problem of developing linguistic power and seek through it personal discipline and en hancement. The complexity, the force of demand, and the opportunities inherent in this task are today most apparent in the pre-school and the junior college, and it is no accident that these are the least tradition bound and freest segments today of American education, My subject here is the junior college English program and how we can find the will and the courage to step outside the pecking order of the English establishment and develop a better model than the senior colleges are presently able to offer us.

Three years ago in Houston at the meeting of the college section, along with many of you here today, I heard Richard Ohmann speak on a subject that pleased me a good deal, that of the possibility of envisioning and shaping English within the modern concept of the discipline. To my mind, though, exciting and promising as his remarks were, they were built on a shaky premise. He said.

> Literature is what holds our interests together in a loose confederation, and I think it a safe guess that literature is what brought nearly all of us into the profession. Literature is our subject matter, and, this being so, an inquiry into the state of the profession must ask how we stand vis-a-vis literature: what are our responsibilities toward it, and how well are we executing them?

That is flattering to our desires but I fear rather badly off target. Somehow the student is overlooked. It is not that the student's interest and his well-being do not include the satisfaction of engaging literature, but that his interests and needs ought to enjoy a higher priority in the shaping of the profession and the discipline than should the interests of professors. That is to say that the emphasis on interests and the reason for the shape of things seems to have become badly skewed in Ohmann's statement. Surely we do not see the profession at the top of the hierarchy concerned only with serving itself and replenishing its own ranks - somehow confident that the larger community will cheerfully continue to support it. We must measure this complscent version of our condition against Hogan's concern and King and Brownell's attempt to relate community and intellect and we dare not fail to recognize that there is a broader discourse than ours attempting to shape American education which ultimately could be decisive and is likely to rule contrary to our interests unless we become involved in it. This larger discourse, powerful, wrongheaded, and, I am convinced, insidious, sees Ohmann's view of English as provincial and indefensible. I wonder how well prepared the prestige figures in our profession are to respond to that new breed, those managers of education, the behavioral objectives advocates, the systems analysts, and the politicians who we are told want quantifyable educational change in return for their dollars? They want accountability.

Nevertheless I am grateful to Ohmann for giving us a suggestive framework for thinking about English. Setting aside my objections to the scope and purposes he identifies for English, I believe that the kind of framework he presents could begin to open up the curriculum of English and relate the making of its content to the learning of its content so that we might develop a viable alternative to the present framework which reduces the student's experience with English to an endless preparation for some future ideal performance. I believe that if we attempt to view English through the student's eyes we find him spending his years in English getting ready for the ultimate performance as he works his way out of a series of Chinese boxes -- the shpae of which he is never privileged to view from the outside -- to what in the end turns out not to be the world of wide experience made assessible through a varied and discriminating literacy, but the priestly and professionalized world oriented to the English major, itself dictated by the requirements for the B.A., the M.A., and so forth, like fleas on fleas. This is the world of the trickle down English major. It is time for a new metaphor. We should exchange the Chinese boxes for the encompassing and resilient net, pulling into the substantive center of the discipline -- whatever contributes to modern literacy, including of course literature -- whatever is relevent and expunging inexorably what has become irrelevant. The substantive center should be a modern literacy that engages and

and impinges critically upon the world we have created.

I can envision a pedagogically oriented seminar offered in the English department, exploring the roots of modern literacy, bringing together the best talent in the department to inquire into the contributions of such persons as Coleridge, Wordsworth, Spurgeon, Lowes, Langer, Koehler, the Gestalt psychologist, Arnheim, the art and film critic, Kroeber, the anthropologist, Dewey, Erik Erikson, Polanyi, yes, and even Fellini, McLuhan and Mailer. I can envision it, but presently I can hardly imagine it.

I can't because it appears to me that the English Establishment at its apex is almost immobilized, incapable of protracted, meaningful rational dialogue on subjects related to the pedagogy of English. But then I must confess that I am not at all sure that junior college English instructors are not tempted to find respectability by somehow emulating the senior college model. I am hopeful, though, that more authentic voices will inform us that there is no responsible and satisfying existence for us in the junior college in the long run if we adopt that model, and our alternative is to learn to communicate.

In the last issue of The Center Magazine, the late John Courtney Murray wrote:

> Barbarism / defined as the failure to live together and to talk together in a reasonable manner / threatens. There are laws of argument, the observance of which is imperative

> if discourse is to be civilized. Argument ceases to be civil when it is dominated by passion and prejudice; when its vocabulary becomes solipsist, premised on the theory that my insight is mine alone and cannot be shared; when dialogue gives way to a series of monologues; when the parties to the conversation cease to listen to one another, or hear only what they want to hear ... When things like this happen, men cannot be locked together in argument. Conversation becomes merely quarrelsome or querulous. Civility dies with the death of dialogue.

One must ask, "Is there a community of English that can hold a dialogue? If so does it really believe in a dialogue directed at its civil raison d'etre, the education of all citizens? " I am afraid we can find no such model for exploration in the graduate departments of English, where it is the shadow faculties -- those without an official voice -- who usually conduct that exceedingly important function of college English departments, the instruction of non-major undergraduates.

Thus I am not hopeful that the graduate departments will come to grips in the short run with the problem of offering a relevant training for junior college English instructors, although I feel strongly that in the long run we will need them as much as they will need us. After one of the ten workshops we held in connection with our national study a member of a state college English department wrote:

> My interest in junior colleges began two years ago, when some of my students with MA degrees told me that they were having difficulty finding junior college teaching

> posts. Soon enough, I discovered that among the factors was one of inadequate preparation on our part: we were applying for teaching positions where they had to cope with pre-pre-remedial English classes. I organized a symposium on "Teaching English in the Junior Colleges" . . .The relevations shook many of us, teachers and students; we had no idea of what junior college English teaching meant. As a follow up I asked a dozen. . . junior college chairmen to meet with a dozen of our senior faculty members (including several key members of the Graduate Curriculum Committee) so that we might exchange views. More shock -- in that we had spelled out for us how our present MA programs failed to prepare students for junior college teaching of English.

This healthy response to a bad situation nevertheless suggests, perhaps, by the term "pre-pre-remedial" that one sacrifices more satisfying goals to take on the drab task of teaching in the junior college. I have not found this to be the case and I believe that new instructors find the position more and more satifsying as they free themselves of the prejudices of graduate study and recognize that they are training citizens who want access to a literacy that prepares them for intelligent participation and decision making, rather than to become English majors. Large numbers of these students are the first generation to come to college. Teaching English in the junior college is not an easy job, but it is not a second rate job.

Now I would like to take note of some national trends that I believe affect us all and must be reckoned with as we ask what should be the nature of the junior college English department and its relation to the senior colleges. Such an examination I believe further supports the case for more dialogue between the two departments. With the rapid expansion of higher education, we find more and more of the better trained high school graduates going into the senior colleges, which are not expanding as dramatically as the junior colleges are to accommodate the national need. However, the senior colleges are enjoying what may be called a prosperous era only if we view it narrowly. Wilcox notes a trend in such schools to eliminate freshman composition, the teaching of which he labels training, so that they can move immediately into the literature courses, where he indicates they will then be receiving education. The training-education dichotomy is pleasant to some ears, but I believe it is unfortunate. It fits the perceptions of those who equate the discipline of English with the reading and criticizing of literature, but it supports an unhealthy elitism that in the long run, I believe, will serve no one well.

One result of the dramatic expansion of higher education has been, to encourage what I would like to label a more overt and systematically defined national tracking system which supports rather than discourages elitism in American higher education. I believe there is a more or less conscious collaboration between the testing people, the university lobbies, the USOE, and the educational managers and legislators who are the

architects of state master plans for higher education, which rigidifies the tracking feature of higher education and increases the conceptual and psychological distance between the junior and senior colleges, as if that process needed extramural encouragement. One result is a diminishment of the healthy mix of students with different backgrounds and the decrease in the number of minority students in senior colleges. Certainly that is so in California whose master plan had been looked to as a model and copied in one form or another by many states. Under the circumstances, I can only applaud the action of black and Puerto Rican students at City University of New York, since they <u>are</u> being excluded from their fair share of society's educational opportunities and because they have focused attention on the real nerve ending, equitable financial support for all.

One sometimes gets the impression from people on the university campuses, who ought to know better, that the physical presence of "the less qualified" upon the campus grounds, like a disease, affects adversely the quality of research and education.

The following analysis of support of higher education in California is unquestionably a national pattern. In the mid 60's the University of California student was backed by a subsidy of $5,000, the state college student by $3,000, and the junior college student by $1,000. The amount of subsidy turns out to be in direct ratio to ability to pay, i.e., the more able to pay, by virtue of family affluence, the more support from the state, while 40% of the young people of college age receive no subsidy

at all in college, although their parents pay their share for the support of higher education. We may be sure that arguments related to morality, character, national need, and the folklore of meritocracy will surface to defend any challenge to the present publicly supported elitism in higher education.

Focusing more directly on the junior college, I see two other matters that place strictures on the performance of the junior college English department. I believe both are related to what I would call a more or less innocent authoritarianism in the relationship between departments and administration. The matter of a viable sharing of authority and of curricular planning has apparently not been carefully developed by the majority of junior colleges. A department characterized by movement, ferment and dialogue will not exist when, as our study indicates, 77% of chairmen are appointed with no participation in the decision by the staff, and when of those chairmen responding to our questionnaire 45% have either indefinite or permanent tenure in office and 21% serve by year to year appointment, neither of these being supportive of dialogue and intelligent planning.

With such a relationship between a staff and administration the rule rather than the exception, it should not be surprising that simplistic behavioral frameworks are being imposed by administrative ruling on English programs, frameworks that deal only with the surface of literacy and tend to smother any probing exploration of the problem of eliciting a complex and humane response from students, many of whom have been deprived of just such experiences throughout their education. Lurking behind this behavioral push, I feel certain, is the inexorable book-

keeping that rationalizes the national tracking system in higher education. It goes like this: Increasing numbers will be squeezed into the junior colleges and we will devise a cut-rate means of acquiring the name but not the game of universal higher education. The best and most effective junior college English instructors that I know reject such efforts to shape up their programs and their students. They reject both chinese boxes and the iron bed of Procrustes that the behaviorists are pushing and in California are establishing as a part of the state educational plan at the school level. The stated goal for "adoption and implementation in all California school districts" in the new PPBS, (Planning/Programming/ Budgeting System) is 1970. The goal is to "evaluate programs in terms of objectives, costs and benefits." The state has brought in as consultants the firm of Peat, Morwick, and Mitchell. Basic to PPBS is that the achievement of behavioral objectives is measurable and - seldom noted - what is not measurable is not important. Anyone who thinks that there is not a dialogue at the administrative-managerial level in the junior college movement to institute such a plan has not been doing his homework. Any conscientious junior college educator-including conscientious administrators-might start by reading Anthony G. Oettinger's Run, Computer, Run: The Mythology of Educational Innovation, published by Harvard University Press.

Oettinger's contention is that amazing projects have been undertaken by the managers of education, only to fail for lack of hard know-

ledge needed to make success possible.

What, then, can the Junior College English instructor do:

1. If he cannot find acceptable models for his programs in the senior colleges nor evidence of any sizeable effort to help him deal with his unique assignment in the near future.
2. If he suspects that a developing national pattern if passively accepted would rob him and his students of the opportunity to create a humane relationship and cultivate a humane growth of their literacy,
3. If he feels that in order to survive and develop his own model for a professional career he must learn to build a responsible autonomy vis a vis administration and the senior colleges,
4. If he becomes increasingly convinced that if he continues to do what he has done so far, adjust to the wishes of the graduate departments, accept inherited formats for instruction uncritically, and wait for possible help from his administrators, he will be smothered by numbers of students and by increasingly stagnant and mechanical assignments.

I think he must learn to develop a meaningful dialogue with his peers, assert a responsible militance vis a vis his administrators and the senior colleges and convert his department into a center of inquiry into the development of literacy among the variety of adults, young and old, that he serves. Literacy in this context includes using literature in all ways that are relevant to the bulding of modern literacy, but a junior college English department should not be viewed as a department of literature with certain training and remedial appendages carried on as a service to the total school.

I would like to see junior college English departments insist that procedures be developed to strengthen the chairmanship and give the department a sense of continuity. Departments need support in developing English programs that meet the junior college commitment, that of honestly striving to induct any adult, who elects to try, into higher education. This I think calls for the establishing of checks and balances between staff, chairman and administration that give the staff an increased sense of autonomy without adopting some of the less desirable procedures of the senior colleges. It also calls for providing a space in the grid of assignments that parallels that provided for research and scholarship in the senior college, but in the junior college it would be devoted to cooperative inquiry into problems of pedagogy. The fact is that a dimension of the department's activity, that of inquiry and experimentation, has had almost no attention since the inception of the junior college. While the junior college has sometimes revelled in the label "a teaching college," it has done little to explore the nature and complexity of its own assignment. Instead it has patterned itself after the senior college and appended a remedial or tracked program ancillary to a central effort, the senior college transfer program.

The department would need to develop policies for initiating experimentation and for maintaining some balance between the ongoing and developing program and the experimental arm of its activities. Inquiry would be discussed, developed, and evaluated as a part of a departmental dialogue which could be used to induct new instructors into the climate of inquiry,

providing an opportunity for them to exchange ideas and invite visitation or arrange visits to the classes of other instructors, thus minimizing the anxiety and strangeness associated with evaluation and tenure.

It is important to recognize that all of this raises questions or morale, and personal anxiety, as a new relationship with administration, one's colleagues--andprobably students develops. It would be disingenuous to assume that English instructors, however verbal, are skilled and easy in discussing their teaching and in building trust that would allow them to learn from each other readily and develop better pedagogy. Therefore, it would be wise to consider the following as strategies for building such a milieu:

1. Build a format that allows for the optimum of pluralism consistent with departmental responsibilities.

2. For those who find it compatible make it easy to cooperate and experiment together.

3. Do not make it hard for instructors to refrain from active participation. (In the long run make it too attractive to stay away from.)

4. Recognize that experimental design can often be improved by outside help.

5. Recognize that outside help can sometimes facilitate communication, that there are people outside the staff who can help members resolve hangups, but only if participation is voluntary.

6. Recognize that in some cases administrators play a helpful role.

7. Recognize that untapped energy and positive communication can be released through student involvement as aides and tutors, but that this calls for careful planning, the time of instructors and perhaps the development of specialists among the staff. Like love, the teaching-learning experience is inexhaustible in its capacity to generate itself. In a society where men will turn increasingly to humane services, one of which is teaching, the words of Erik Erikson are relevant:

> Man needs to teach, not only for the sake of those who need to be taught and not only for the fulfillment of his identity, but because facts are kept alive by being told, logic by being demonstrated, truth by being professed. Thus the teaching passion is not restricted to the teaching profession. Every mature adult knows the satisfaction of explaining what is dear to him and of being understood by a groping mind.

We can do a good deal more to exploit the students' intelligence, creativity and need to teach.

I would like to conclude with some questions that I think a junior college English department conducting itself as a center of inquiry might investigate, and I would invite my colleagues in both the junior and senior colleges to join the dialogue--because I believe that dialogue and survival are interdependent today. If they seem merely speculative, it is not true. Most are practices discovered in our study. If they seem designed for inducting the marginal student, they are mainly but they only scratch the surface of what we should be developing for all of our students.

1. How can we devise formats for certain kinds of student work with flexible time limits, i.e. make the adjustment to student differences through specifications in a "contract" rather than through a grading scale tied to an arbitrary number of weeks for a class? Obviously only certain subject matter lends itself to such formats. This would allow a department to test Bloom's contention that most educational achievement is accessible to most people if arbitrary time limits are not imposed. Probably such an experiment would at first involve use of some of the small number of good programed texts now available, although it is quite likely that once we turned our minds to the problem we would find other applications. This suggests an inquiry into the value of a context for using programed material that provides a "counterpoint" between individual work to acquire new knowledge and skills and an opportunity to discuss with others the concepts being developed.

2. What are the values in attempting to elicit fluency from students with "writing problems" by having them write informally on the spot--with no evaluation to follow? Can we determine what kind of student profits from this? Would such an analysis divide students on the basis of psychological types or symbolic needs rather than on skill deficiencies? What must an instructor learn in order to elicit fluent writing from students on the spot? Could certain types of students work with others, sharing writing experiences? What value might derive from asking students to cover space, i.e. write a certain number of pages within a certain time, to develop fluency? If this is carried on for a longer or shorter period, does it make any difference? How do we move beyond fluency or release from inhibition in writing to the controlled development of ideas without raising old ghosts?

3. Can we develop some workable means of dividing students, other than on the basis of skill achievement, that will allow us to help them work through stages that resolve their own needs?

4. What difference would it make in their total record if we told students they could not take his English composition course until their second year in college.

5. What happens to a student's writing proficiency between the time when he completes successfully his freshman composition course and his last semester as a sophomore in the junior college?

6. Are there ways to use "workshops in self-confrontation" in conjunction with writing perhaps with the help of someone in the psychology department, to "awaken" certain students?

7. How can an English department develop responsible uses of multi-sensory pre-writing experiences?

8. What difference would it make if in all classes in English, Social Science and General Science instructors asked students to write for the last ten minutes of every class, summarizing or responding to the class?

9. What could we do for "poor" students if we gave them a daily back-to-back two-hour session in which they read silently, discussed the material, then write about it? Could instructors explore together and test out the best uses of the two hours, experimenting with patterns long enough to get more than superficial student reaction? Can we develop first semester half-day writing, viewing, reading, discussing "immersion experiences" to induct "non-academic" students into college?

10. What techniques can we develop to get below the stereotyped responses that students give in reacting to or evaluating a class in order to get at more honest if "inexpressible"needs? (One suspects that the more tied up and "remedial" the student is, the more conventional and phoney his responses are likely to be.)

11. Could an English staff benefit from the services of an ombudsman who could listen to instructors, sit in on meetings, seek out and be available to individuals, including students, and report periodically to the department? Who should he be? A non-faculty psychologist? A respected member of the staff from another discipline?

12. Could departments benefit from a series of presentations followed by dicussions on the following:

The uses of writing in developing inwardness and self-awareness.

The possible uses and hazards in recent developments in sensitivity development and interpersonal dynamics.

The characteristics of the poor, the culture of the poor and the deprived, and the relevance of these to the school's English programs.

Characteristics of junior college students as compared with those of the total higher education population and the implications of these differences for instruction.

Studies of form in various media.

What we know about differences in response to reading by individuals and how these differences can be used to help students read with greater understanding and instructors to see their role as teachers of reading more realistically.

The uses of students as teacher aides and teacher associates to elicit certain responses from, and to develop communication with students that cannot be developed within the instructor-student relationship.